

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the comments set forth fully below. Claims 2-6, 10-17, 20-25, 27-36, 38-45 and 47 were pending. Within the Office Action, Claims 2-6, 10-17, 20-25, 27-36, 38-45 and 47 have been rejected. Accordingly, Claims 2-6, 10-17, 20-25, 27-36, 38-45 and 47 are now pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Within the Office Action, Claims 2, 22 and 35 have been rejected 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention. It is also stated within the Office Action that any child of claims 2, 22 and 35 are rejected for inheriting the deficiency. Furthermore, within the Office Action, Claims 2, 22 and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps. Specifically, it is stated within the Office Action that the step how to handle an unwrapped version of the content is omitted. Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are indefinite and omit essential steps. The claims sufficiently describe wrapping the link if it is determined to do so and not wrapping the link if the link is resolvable by an Internet DNS. The claims then describe delivering a modified version of the content which includes the wrapped version of the link. Although there is no limitation regarding the unwrapped link, the claim is still sufficiently clear and complete.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Within the Office Action, Claims 2-6, 10-17, 20, 22-25, 27-33, 35, 36, 38-42, 44, 45 and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,163,779 to Mantha et al. (hereinafter Mantha) in view of U.S. Pat. App. No. 2002/0116444 to Chaudhri et al. (hereinafter Chaudhri). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Mantha teaches a method of copying a web page presented for display on a browser of a web client. The method includes first copying the base HTML document to the client local storage and establishing a pointer to the copied document. A first linked list of the hypertext references in the base document is then generated. For each hypertext reference in the first linked list, if the hypertext reference refers to an embedded object in the base HTML document, the embedded object is saved on the client local storage and the file name of the saved embedded object is stored (as a fully-qualified URL) in a second linked list. If the hypertext reference does not refer to an embedded object in the base HTML document, the fully-qualified URL of the

hypertext reference is stored in the second linked list. Then, the fully-qualified URLs of the second linked list (including those associated with the stored images) are updated to point to the files located on the client local storage. In the end, there is a new HTML page with links for images pointing to files on the local hard drive. When the user desires to retrieve the copied page, a link to the pointer is activated. [Mantha, Abstract] However, Mantha does not teach a method wherein a server or a reverse proxy server performs the steps. This difference has not been appreciated within the Office Action as evidenced by the citation of Mantha, col. 8, lines 1-30 which discusses a client machine and even states, “the method is implemented in a client machine such as a personal computer...” [Mantha, col. 8, lines 19-20] Thus, Mantha does not teach retrieving, by the server, said first electronic content from said network. Furthermore, Mantha does not teach the additional limitations which are performed by the server as opposed to a client device. As is recognized within the Office Action, Mantha does not teach determining, by the server, whether said link identified in the identifying step is resolvable by an external Internet domain name system or alternatively by a domain name system internal to said network.

Chaudhri teaches a method and system for providing improved acceleration of network content using an intermediate node and/or dynamic translations. [Chaudhri, Abstract] More specifically, Chaudhri teaches retargetters which speed up network content delivery. However, Chaudhri does not teach a method wherein a server or a reverse proxy server performs the steps of the claimed invention. Specifically, Chaudhri does not teach retrieving, by the server, said first electronic content from said network. Chaudhri also does not teach determining, by the server, whether said link identified in the identifying step is resolvable by an external Internet domain name system or alternatively by a domain name system internal to said network. Although Chaudhri discusses DNS in general, in Tables 3 and 4 and paragraphs 51, 65, 72, 85 and 86, Chaudhri does not teach determining, by the server, whether said link identified in the identifying step is resolvable by an external Internet domain name system or alternatively by a domain name system internal to said network.

In contrast to Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination the present invention is directed to a method, device or system for providing information from a network including a network device to a client device outside of the network via a server associated with the network. In some embodiments, a method comprises receiving a request from the client device at the server for a first electronic content from the network, retrieving, by the server, said first electronic content from said network, identifying, by the server, a link within said first electronic content, determining, by the server, whether said link identified in said step (c) is resolvable by an

external Internet domain name system or alternatively by a domain name system internal to said network, wrapping, by the server, said link to obtain a wrapped version of said link that identifies a resolvable address on the network in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the domain name system internal to said network, and not wrapping said link in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the external Internet domain name system and delivering a modified version of said first electronic content to the client device, wherein said modified version of said first electronic content includes said wrapped version of said link. As described above, Mantha does not teach determining whether a link is resolvable by an Internet or a local DNS. Mantha also does not teach determining whether to wrap a link based on whether the link is resolvable by an Internet or a local DNS. The links in Mantha are downloaded to a local disk drive and all links are wrapped. Furthermore, Mantha teaches activity on the client-side not on the server-side. As also described above, Chaudhri does not teach determining, by the server, whether said link identified in the identifying step is resolvable by an external Internet domain name system or alternatively by a domain name system internal to said network. Therefore, Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination do not teach retrieving, by the server, said first electronic content from said network. Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination also do not teach determining, by the server, whether said link identified in the identifying step is resolvable by an external Internet domain name system or alternatively by a domain name system internal to said network, or wrapping, by the server, said link to obtain a wrapped version of said link that identifies a resolvable address on the network in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the domain name system internal to said network, and not wrapping said link in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the external Internet domain name system.

The independent Claim 2 is directed to a method for providing information from a network including a network device to a client device outside of the network via a server associated with the network. The method of Claim 2 comprises receiving a request from the client device at the server for a first electronic content from said network, retrieving, by the server, said first electronic content from said network, identifying, by the server, a link within said first electronic content, determining, by the server, whether said link identified in said step (c) is resolvable by an external Internet domain name system or alternatively by a domain name system internal to said network, wrapping, by the server, said link to obtain a wrapped version of said link that identifies a resolvable address on the network in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the domain name system internal to said network, and not

wrapping said link in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the external Internet domain name system and delivering a modified version of said first electronic content to the client device, wherein said modified version of said first electronic content includes said wrapped version of said link. As described above, Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination do not teach retrieving, by the server, said first electronic content from said network. Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination also do not teach determining, by the server, whether said link identified in the identifying step is resolvable by an external Internet domain name system or alternatively by a domain name system internal to said network. Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination also do not teach wrapping, by the server, said link to obtain a wrapped version of said link that identifies a resolvable address on the network in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the domain name system internal to said network, and not wrapping said link in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the external Internet domain name system. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 2 is allowable over the teachings of Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination.

Claims 3-6, 10-17 and 20 are dependent upon the independent claim 2. As discussed above, the independent claim 2 is allowable over the teachings of Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination. Accordingly, claims 3-6, 10-17 and 20 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Furthermore, Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination do not teach the dependent Claim 5 which includes the limitation: said link includes an external address portion identifying said network device and an internal address portion identifying a second electronic content within said network. Within the Office Action, Mantha, Figure 15 is cited as teaching this limitation. Specifically, within the Office Action, “www.artscape.com” is cited as the external address portion and “/ceramics.html” is cited as the internal address portion. However, this is clearly improper. The cited URL in Mantha is merely a standard URL with “www.artscape.com” as the host name and “/ceramics.html” as the path or specific resource within the host to be accessed. In contrast, the present invention includes an external address portion (294) that identifies the server (or reverse proxy server) and is resolvable outside the local network, and also includes an internal address portion (296) that is associated with electronic content that resides within the local network and is resolvable by the server but is not resolvable outside the local network. [Present Specification, Page 13, lines 7-12 and accompanying Figure 2D] For at least these additional reasons, Claim 5 is allowable over the teachings of Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination.

The independent Claim 22 is directed to one or more processor readable storage devices having processor readable code embodied on said processor readable storage devices, said processor readable code for programming one or more processors to perform a method for providing information from a network including a network device to a client device outside of the network via a reverse proxy server associated with the network. The method of the one or more processor readable storage devices comprises receiving a request from the client device at the server for a first electronic content from said network, retrieving, by the reverse proxy server, said first electronic content from said network, identifying, by the reverse proxy server, a link within said first electronic content, determining, by the reverse proxy server, whether said link identified in said step (c) is resolvable by an external Internet domain name system or alternatively by a domain name system internal to said network, wrapping, by the reverse proxy server, said link to obtain a wrapped version of said link that identifies a resolvable address on the network in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the domain name system internal to said network, and not wrapping said link in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the external Internet domain name system and delivering a modified version of said first electronic content to the client device. As described above, Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination do not teach retrieving, by the reverse proxy server, said first electronic content from said network. Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination also do not teach determining, by the reverse proxy server, whether said link identified in the identifying step is resolvable by an external Internet domain name system or alternatively by a domain name system internal to said network. Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination also do not teach wrapping, by the reverse proxy server, said link to obtain a wrapped version of said link that identifies a resolvable address on the network in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the domain name system internal to said network, and not wrapping said link in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the external Internet domain name system. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination.

Claims 23-25 and 27-33 are dependent upon the independent claim 22. As discussed above, the independent claim 22 is allowable over the teachings of Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination. Accordingly, claims 23-25 and 27-33 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Furthermore, Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination do not teach the dependent Claim 24 which includes the limitation: said link includes an external address portion identifying said

network device and an internal address portion identifying a second electronic content within said network. Within the Office Action, Mantha, Figure 15 is cited as teaching this limitation. Specifically, within the Office Action, “www.artscape.com” is cited as the external address portion and “/ceramics.html” is cited as the internal address portion. However, this is clearly improper. The cited URL in Mantha is merely a standard URL with “www.artscape.com” as the host name and “/ceramics.html” as the path or specific resource within the host to be accessed. In contrast, the present invention includes an external address portion (294) that identifies the server (or reverse proxy server) and is resolvable outside the local network, and also includes an internal address portion (296) that is associated with electronic content that resides within the local network and is resolvable by the server but is not resolvable outside the local network. [Present Specification, Page 13, lines 7-12 and accompanying Figure 2D] For at least these additional reasons, Claim 24 is allowable over the teachings of Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination.

The independent Claim 35 is directed to a system. The system of Claim 35 comprises one or more communication interfaces, one or more storage devices and one or more processor processors in communication with said one or more storage devices and said one or more communication interfaces, said one or more processors performs a method for providing information from a network including a network device, a network device to a client device outside of the network via a reverse proxy server associated with the network, said method comprising the steps of receiving a request from the client device at the server for a first electronic content from said network, retrieving, by the reverse proxy server, said first electronic content from said network, identifying, by the reverse proxy server, a link within said first electronic content, determining, by the reverse proxy server, whether said link identified in said step (c) is resolvable by an external Internet domain name system or alternatively by a domain name system internal to said network, wrapping, by the reverse proxy server, said link to obtain a wrapped version of said link that identifies a resolvable address on the network in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the domain name system internal to said network, and not wrapping said link in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the external Internet domain name system and delivering a modified version of said first electronic content to the client device wherein said modified version of said first electronic content includes said wrapped version of said link. As described above, Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination do not teach retrieving, by the reverse proxy server, said first electronic content from said network. Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination also do not teach determining, by

the reverse proxy server, whether said link identified in the identifying step is resolvable by an external Internet domain name system or alternatively by a domain name system internal to said network. Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination also do not teach wrapping, by the reverse proxy server, said link to obtain a wrapped version of said link that identifies a resolvable address on the network in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the domain name system internal to said network, and not wrapping said link in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the external Internet domain name system. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 35 is allowable over the teachings of Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination.

Claims 36 and 38-42 are dependent upon the independent claim 35. As discussed above, the independent claim 35 is allowable over the teachings of Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination. Accordingly, claims 36 and 38-42 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Furthermore, Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination do not teach the dependent Claim 36 which includes the limitation: said link includes an external address portion identifying said network device, wherein said external address portion can be resolved outside said network and an internal address portion identifying a second electronic content within said network wherein said internal address portion cannot be resolved outside said network and can be resolved in said network. Within the Office Action, Mantha, Figure 15 is cited as teaching this limitation. Specifically, within the Office Action, “www.artscape.com” is cited as the external address portion and “/ceramics.html” is cited as the internal address portion. However, this is clearly improper. The cited URL in Mantha is merely a standard URL with “www.artscape.com” as the host name and “/ceramics.html” as the path or specific resource within the host to be accessed. In contrast, the present invention includes an external address portion (294) that identifies the server (or reverse proxy server) and is resolvable outside the local network, and also includes an internal address portion (296) that is associated with electronic content that resides within the local network and is resolvable by the server but is not resolvable outside the local network. [Present Specification, Page 13, lines 7-12 and accompanying Figure 2D] For at least these additional reasons, Claim 36 is allowable over the teachings of Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination.

The independent Claim 44 is directed to a method for providing information from a network including a network device, a network device to a first client device outside of the network via a reverse proxy server associated with the network. The method of Claim 44

comprises the steps of receiving a request from a second client device for a first electronic content to be sent from said network to the first client device, retrieving, by the reverse proxy server, said first electronic content from said network, identifying, by the reverse proxy server, a link within said first electronic content, determining, by the reverse proxy server, whether said link identified in said step (c) is resolvable by an external Internet domain name system or alternatively by a domain name system internal to said network, wrapping, by the reverse proxy server, said link to obtain a wrapped version of said link that identifies a resolvable address on the network in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the domain name system internal to said network, and not wrapping said link in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the external Internet domain name system, delivering a modified version of said first electronic content to said first client device if said link is wrapped in said step (e), wherein said modified version of said first electronic content includes said wrapped version of said link and delivering an unmodified version of said first electronic content to said first client device if said link is not wrapped in said step (e), wherein said modified version of said first electronic content includes said wrapped version of said link. As described above, Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination do not teach retrieving, by the reverse proxy server, said first electronic content from said network. Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination also do not teach determining, by the reverse proxy server, whether said link identified in the identifying step is resolvable by an external Internet domain name system or alternatively by a domain name system internal to said network. Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination also do not teach wrapping, by the reverse proxy server, said link to obtain a wrapped version of said link that identifies a resolvable address on the network in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the domain name system internal to said network, and not wrapping said link in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the external Internet domain name system. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 44 is allowable over the teachings of Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination.

Claims 45 and 47 are dependent upon the independent claim 44. As discussed above, the independent claim 44 is allowable over the teachings of Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination. Accordingly, claims 45 and 47 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.


Within the Office Action, Claims 21, 34 and 43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,581,065 to Rodkin et al. (hereinafter Rodkin). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 21 is dependent on the independent Claim 2; Claim 34 is dependent on the independent Claim 22 and Claim 43 is dependent on the independent Claim 35. As described above, the independent Claims 2, 22 and 35 are all allowable over the teachings of Mantha, Chaudhri and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 21, 34 and 43 are allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: 9-5-08

By: 
Thomas B. Haverstock
Reg. No. 32,571
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR § 1.8(a))
I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP.

Date: 9-5-08 By: ESH